

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Present Status of Patent Application**

In response to the Office Action dated August 21, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### **2. Interview Summary**

Applicant first wishes to express its sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Almeida spent with Applicant's Attorney, Charles Griggers, during a telephone discussion on November 2, 2006 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During the conversation, potential amendments were discussed that are contained herein. The Examiner seemed to indicate that it would be potentially beneficial for Applicant to make these amendments. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner carefully consider this response and the amendments.

### **3. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 12-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Limsico* (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,952) in view of *Ackroff* (U.S. Patent No. 5,105,438). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Goldberg* (U.S. Patent No. 7,748,890).

#### **a. Independent Claim 1**

As recited in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

A password management system, comprising:  
graphical user interface logic operable to receive a current password from a user, prompt the user to determine whether the user desires to change the current password, and responsive to the user response receive a new password;

password confirmation logic operable to confirm the current password associated with the user on a switched access remote test system;

password administration logic, responsive to the password confirmation logic and the graphical user interface, operable to receive the new password and to change the current password on the switched access remote test system; and

***expiration logic operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "expiration logic operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration," as recited in claim 1.

*Limsico* describes a password changing routine that provides a graphic user interface. In response to receiving a request from a host machine to change a password, the routine sends a user's new password as entered in a password changer window 100. See col. 5, lines 3-12 and col. 10, lines 7-18. *Limsico* describes that a host system tracks an expiration date for a user's password and does not disclose that the password changing routine is capable of performing this function. Rather, the password changing routine relays messages and prompts generated by the host system. For at least this reason, *Limsico* fails to teach or suggest "expiration logic operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration," as recited in claim 1.

*Ackroff* describes an Intelligent Network Channeling Terminating Equipment device that can measure the frequency and level of signals that are sent from a remote location such as from a Switched Access Remote Test System. See col. 5, lines 1-6. *Ackroff* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* for at least the reason that *Ackroff* does not teach or suggest "expiration logic operable to determine if the current

password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration," as recited in claim 1.

Each of the aforementioned cited references fails to teach or suggest features alleged in the Office Action. Other references in the proposed combination fail to remedy the deficiencies of the individual references. Therefore, the proposed combination of references does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. One cannot show obviousness based on a combination of references if claimed features are not disclosed by any of the individual references of the proposed combination.

Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* has not been made, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Dependent Claims 2-11

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-10 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-10 contain all features of independent claim 1. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Further, *Goldberg* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Limsico* and *Ackroff* references, and therefore claim 11 should also be allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 2-11, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable.

As one example, among others, claim 10 recites "a password file operable to store a set of data comprising the expiration date of the current password, wherein the expiration logic is operable to read the password file and request that the graphical user interface notify the user that the current password is nearing expiration responsive to the expiration date" which is not taught or suggested by the cited art. In particular,

*Limsico* clearly states that a user's login and password are not permanently stored in memory. See col. 2, lines 61-67. Therefore, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

c. Independent Claim 12

As recited in independent claim 12, Applicant claims:

A method of managing passwords, comprising:  
providing a user with a graphical user interface;  
receiving a current password from the user via the graphical user interface for a switched access remote test system;  
***determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system;***  
prompting the user on whether to change the current password;  
receiving a new password from the user responsive to the user response to the prompting;  
confirming the current password with the switched access remote test system; and  
requesting that the switched access remote test system change the password responsive to the user response to the prompting.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 12 is allowable for at least the reason that *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system," as recited in claim 12.

*Limsico* describes a password changing routine that provides a graphic user interface. In response to receiving a request from a host machine to change a password, the routine sends a user's new password as entered in a password changer window 100. See col. 5, lines 3-12 and col. 10, lines 7-18. *Limsico* describes that a host system tracks an expiration date for a user's password and does not disclose that the password changing routine is capable of performing this function. Rather, the password changing routine relays messages and prompts generated by the host system. For at least this reason, *Limsico* fails to teach or suggest "determining if the

current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system," as recited in claim 12.

*Ackroff* describes an Intelligent Network Channeling Terminating Equipment device that can measure the frequency and level of signals that are sent from a remote location such as from a Switched Access Remote Test System. See col. 5, lines 1-6. *Ackroff* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* for at least the reason that *Ackroff* does not teach or suggest "determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system," as recited in claim 12.

Each of the aforementioned cited references fails to teach or suggest features alleged in the Office Action. Other references in the proposed combination fail to remedy the deficiencies of the individual references. Therefore, the proposed combination of references does not disclose all of the features of claim 12. One cannot show obviousness based on a combination of references if claimed features are not disclosed by any of the individual references of the proposed combination.

Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* has not been made, and the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

d. Dependent Claims 13-20

Because independent claim 12 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 13-20 (which depend from independent claim 12) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 13-20 contain all features of independent claim 12. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 13-20, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable.

As one example, among others, claim 20 recites "reading a password file to determine an expiration date associated with the current password; and prompting the user to change the password responsive to determination of the expiration date" which is not taught or suggested by the cited art. In particular, *Limsico* clearly states that a user's login and password are not permanently stored in memory. See col. 2, lines 61-67. Therefore, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 20.

Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

e. Independent Claim 21

As recited in independent claim 21, Applicant claims:

A computer readable medium having a program for managing passwords, the program operable to perform:

providing a user with a graphical user interface;  
receiving a current password from the user via the graphical user interface for a switched access remote test system;

*determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system;*

prompting the user on whether to change the current password;  
receiving a new password from the user responsive to the user response to the prompting; confirming the current password with the switched access remote test system;

requesting that the switched access remote test system change the password responsive to the user response to the prompting.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system," as recited in claim 21.

*Limsico* describes a password changing routine that provides a graphic user interface. In response to receiving a request from a host machine to change a password, the routine sends a user's new password as entered in a password changer window 100. See col. 5, lines 3-12 and col. 10, lines 7-18. *Limsico* describes that a host system tracks an expiration date for a user's password and does not disclose that the password changing routine is capable of performing this function. Rather, the

password changing routine relays messages and prompts generated by the host system. For at least this reason, *Limsico* fails to teach or suggest "determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system," as recited in claim 21.

*Ackroff* describes an Intelligent Network Channeling Terminating Equipment device that can measure the frequency and level of signals that are sent from a remote location such as from a Switched Access Remote Test System. See col. 5, lines 1-6. *Ackroff* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* for at least the reason that *Ackroff* does not teach or suggest "determining if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system," as recited in claim 21.

Each of the aforementioned cited references fail to teach or suggest features alleged in the Office Action. Other references in the proposed combination fail to remedy the deficiencies of the individual references. Therefore, the proposed combination of references does not disclose all of the features of claim 21. One cannot show obviousness based on a combination of references if claimed features are not disclosed by any of the individual references of the proposed combination.

Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* has not been made, and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

f. Dependent Claims 22-29

Because independent claim 21 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 22-29 (which depend from independent claim 21) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 22-29 contain all features of independent claim 21. See, e.g., *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the rejection to these claims should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 22-29, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the

cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable.

As one example, among others, claim 29 recites "reading a password file to determine an expiration date associated with the current password; and prompting the user to change the password responsive to determination of the expiration date" which is not taught or suggested by the cited art. In particular, *Limsico* clearly states that a user's login and password are not permanently stored in memory. See col. 2, lines 61-67. Therefore, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 29.


Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1750  
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500